

Illinois U Library

APRIL 18, 1946

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

VINCENT SHEEAN
CECIL BROWN

C. G. PAULDING
LOTHROP STODDARD

(See also page 12)

COMING

—April 25, 1946—

What Should Be Our Policy Toward Russia?

—May 2, 1946—

**What Can We As Individuals Do To Help
Prevent World Famine?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 11, NUMBER 51



\$4.50 A YEAR : 10c A COPY

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 18:

"Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. BROWN	4
Mr. STODDARD	6
Mr. SHEEAN	8
Mr. PAULDING	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	15



THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 25:

"What Should Be Our Policy Toward Russia?"



THE BROADCAST OF MAY 2:

"What Can We As Individuals Do To Help Prevent World Famine?"



The Broadcast of April 18, 1946, originated in Town Hall, in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



APRIL 18, 1946

VOL. 11, No. 51

Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?

Announcer:

It's Town Meeting in Town Hall in New York City just off Times Square. The American Broadcasting Company and associated radio stations bring you America's favorite forum program, America's Town Meeting of the Air. The program originally announced for tonight, "What Can We As Individuals Do To Help Prevent World-wide Famine?" with the new head of UNRRA, the Honorable Fiorello H. LaGuardia, former mayor of New York City, and three other experts on this question, has been postponed until May 2 in order that we might bring you a discussion of this timely topic introduced yesterday into the United Nations Security Council meeting, "Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?" Now here is our moderator, the president of Town Hall and founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. The eyes of the world are once more turned to Franco Spain. Yesterday the Polish delegate to the United Nations Security Council, Dr. Oscar Lange, presented a four-point indictment against Franco Spain on the grounds that it is a threat to world peace, is causing international friction, is harboring former Nazi leaders and agents, and called upon all member states to sever diplomatic relations with Spain.

Most of you will remember that Spain was a scene of horrible suffering and civil war during the years 1936-37 and 1938. When the republican government of Spain was overthrown by the present Franco regime aided by Hitler and Mussolini, the Loyalists or Republicans were aided by an international legion consisting of citizens of many nations but strongly supported by Communist Russia. Hence, the Spanish Civil War was

sometimes referred to as a preview of World War II.

While Franco was able to keep Spain from active participation in the war, his sympathies were clearly with his defeated friends, Hitler and Mussolini. Spain remains the last stronghold of Fascism on the Continent.

But is it a threat to world peace? Cecil Brown, foreign correspondent, radio commentator and author, and Vincent Sheean who was in Spain as a foreign correspondent during her Civil War days, agree with Dr. Lange and uphold the affirmative of tonight's question.

Mr. C. G. Paulding, literary editor of the magazine, *The Commonweal*, and Lothrop Stoddard, author and commentator for station WMAL in Washington uphold the negative.

We hear first from Mr. Cecil Brown, author of the book *Suez to Singapore* and distinguished commentator, Mr. Brown. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Brown:

I agree with your statement on the dispute, Mr. Denny, and I share the views of those of the Security Council who charge that Franco Spain endangers peace. Franco Spain is serving the same purpose today that it has since 1936. It is the spawning ground of war. On that basis we propose to make our case tonight that Franco Spain is a threat to the peace of the world.

How could it be any other way?

No, not because Spain might have factories for making atomic bombs. That may or may not be true at the moment. But what is true and indisputable are the facts of history.

One fact is that the republican government of Spain in 1936 was chosen by the people in a noble and unique effort to achieve democracy and it was driven out of the country by the Spanish Fascists with the aid of the German and Italian Fascists.

The second fact is that during World War II Franco Spain was a partner of Hitler. Franco gave active and extensive aid to Germany to help bring death to American, British, and Russian fighting men. That fact is no more debatable than whether the Germans bombed Rotterdam or whether the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

So if Mr. Paulding and Mr. Stoddard choose tonight to support Franco Spain, let it be remembered that they are in the paradoxical position of supporting the active partner of Germany. (*Applause.*)

Franco Spain is a threat to world peace because Franco and his Falangists and his cutthroats can survive only if Fascism survives in this world. They know that. They have said so, and they based their entire career of murder and their necks on the survival of Fascism. There-

fore, their one hope of saving their power and their necks is in the promotion and expansion of Fascism.

Is Fascism peaceful? Is it for the betterment of mankind? Does it shun aggression?

The record of the history of Fascism was written by Italy and Germany and Japan. We all know what that was—more treasure down the drain than anyone can estimate; twenty million men, women, and children dead, and more broken bodies and shattered minds than one dares to recall in review.

We have just finished the job of trying to decide on the battlefield whether Fascism should survive. Franco remains unconvinced, and, for us, he remains a shocking bit of unfinished business.

The American and British governments offer the view that we must not interfere in the internal affairs of Spain. In the case of Spain, it would be no more interference in the internal affairs of that country than it was interference in the internal affairs of Germany when our troops crossed the Rhine River to rip out the heart of Fascism. (*Applause.*) Besides, it seems to me that action against Franco Spain here and now is mandatory under the Charter.

It is probable that our opponents will say that we can't permit Communism to overtake Spain. That's the stock argument. It was the argument used by Adolph Hit-

ler. He, too, presented himself as the protector of Christianity, the crusader against Bolshevism, the savior of Europe. That was his story while the Germans descended to a barbarism unequaled in history, while Hitler built bigger and better concentration camps and shoved millions of people into stronger and tighter gas chambers—a grim way to save Christianity.

Franco uses the same words but he differs in one respect. His butchery is on a smaller scale. Our opponents tonight may want you to accept Franco as the protector of Christianity, the crusader against Communism. They may ask you to accept a carbon copy of Hitler as the hero of the Spanish people.

Well, I am neither so contemptuous of the Spanish people nor so contemptuous of democracy. I am not afraid for democracy when it competes with Communism for the hearts and minds of people. (*Applause.*)

I am far more confident than our opponents may be that the vast majority of the people of Spain and the world have an innate opposition to tyranny, whether it is Fascism, Communism, or monarchism; that there is in the great masses of people everywhere the burning, yearning desire to be free in heart, in mind, in person.

We have so much better a bill of goods to sell to the Spanish people. We have the principles of

democracy. When Russia and Poland demand that Franco be driven out of Spain, we Americans can not stand before the world in the position of backing Fascism in Spain. That is a direct and tragic contradiction of the whole basic reason we were given for fighting this war—to destroy Fascism everywhere.

We have been contradictory enough in Italy by jacking up the Fascists' King Victor Emmanuel and other Fascist war criminals. (*Applause.*)

Secretary of State Byrnes is going to resist the Russian efforts to gain a foothold in the Mediterranean and in Spain. Good enough. Let us do it by making the principles of democracy, the genuine freedom for people, more attractive to people than Communism. Let us do it by giving the Spanish people what they want—their interrupted chance at freedom.

The first step in that process is to drive out Franco and restore Spain with a republican government. Is Franco's Spain a threat to peace. We say, most emphatically "yes." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Cecil Brown. Now may we hear from another distinguished author and commentator of station WMAL in Washington, D. C., Mr. Lothrop Stoddard. Mr. Stoddard. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Stoddard:

"Franco Spain" is such a fighting phrase that to understand the issue raised by Poland before the Security Council of the United Nations, we should consider it factually, rather than with our emotions.

Poland's complaint is based upon three specific charges and an underlying generalization. They should be considered separately because they connote very different things.

Poland charges the Franco government with, first, concentrating large numbers of troops near the French border; second, harboring a large number of war criminals and Nazi leaders; and third, promoting scientific research by German scientists engaged in devising new methods of warfare. Let us consider them in turn.

It seems strange that Poland places first on the list Spanish border troop concentrations, because it is most unlikely that these could endanger international peace and security. Any Spanish aggression on France, which is a major member of the United Nations, would bring down on Spain decisive actions of the United Nations, which Spain could be clearly unable to resist. Those Spanish troops are there in answer to France shutting the border in spite of advice of the British and American governments to the contrary.

Regarding the harboring of

Nazis, our State Department last week gave out information that our Government has been negotiating the matter with some success. So that matter seems to be in process of solution by ordinary diplomatic methods.

Poland says the German scientists and technicians are in Spain experimenting on new weapons, implying atomic bomb research. Here again our State Department has given out some information. Denying a published report that it had uncovered atom bomb plots in Spain, the Department spokesman went on to say, "The Department has no information that German-owned factories in Spain are working on atomic research."

The Franco government has branded this Polish charge as fully false and has invited all members of the United Nations, with whom it maintains regular, diplomatic relations, to send "A committee of their technicians freely to circulate in our country, visiting its manufacturing establishments and experimental stations."

Of course, if Poland has reasonable proof that German-conducted research on new methods of warfare, atomic or otherwise, are taking place in Spain, that might well constitute such a threat to international peace and security as would justify action by the United Nations. However, the burden of proof is clearly upon Poland to substantiate its charge and, Mr.

Brown, the same thing goes for you and Mr. Sheean. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mere hearsay will not suffice and will tend to confirm President Truman's remark, at his news conference last week, when he characterized Poland's bringing up of the Franco issue before the Security Council as "It is political, I think."

Now as to the underlying consideration for Poland's action which rests on the argument that the Franco regime by its very nature is a menace to international peace and security, regardless of what it does now or its war-making capacity. But, this involves the principle of the right of intervention in the domestic affairs of nations, which, if admitted, could have far-reaching applications to any nation, including our own. To avert just such possibilities, paragraph seven of Article Two of the United Nations Charter reads "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter."

The words "any state" obviously include nations not members of the United Nations, so it cannot be legally maintained that the Council can take action against Spain merely on account of her internal situation, despite her non-

membership any more than it could take action against any member for similar reasons. So here, Poland's underlying thesis looks debatable on legal grounds. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Lothrop Stoddard.

Our next speaker is a well-known foreign correspondent, who covered the Spanish Civil War, was a Lieutenant Colonel in the Army in World War II, and is the author of a new book, *This House Against This House*, Mr. Vincent Sheean. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Sheean:

It appears to me that Mr. Stoddard's argument is legalistic. Of course, if we are talking about the possibility or the probability of an attack by Franco right now on any member of the United Nations, we are verging upon the absurd. It is not to be expected that this bankrupt Fascist adventurer will go out tomorrow and make war upon the United States, the Soviet Union, or the French Republic.

There is only one reason, of course, why he does not do so, and that is that he can't.

But does that make him any the less a force inimical to peace? However small his power, however puny his resources, he will use them when and if he can, and we know by the evidence of everything he has written, said, and caused to be printed in Spain dur-

ing the past six years that he is our enemy. (*Applause.*)

He is merely awaiting his opportunity. How can we possibly contend that this gives him a clean bill of health?

In my view, Fascism anywhere is a threat to world peace, and I believe that this was the view of those who founded the United Nations on January 1, 1942.

The specific charges made by the Polish delegate in the Security Council yesterday are another question, and one which may be argued or considered or countered. For example, a hasty clean-up of the Bilbao factory might remove any evidence of German activity there. Similarly, the 2,200 German Nazis, whom our State Department considers obnoxious, may be surrendered by their cowardly patron in his efforts to curry favor with the democracies.

But if all these specific charges are met in such ways, and if Franco is able to show that he is not at present engaged in any conspiracy against us, there still would remain the fact that his dictatorship is dedicated to Fascism, which means the racist ideal, predatory nationalism, and war.

It is the very essence of Fascism that it aims at war, which, according to Mussolini many years ago, is the highest state of mankind, and one which brings out all the fascist virtues.

Franco made no secret of this

fact for years when he was parading around Madrid with Ciano and Ribbentrop, exchanging their Hitler salute and haranguing his followers about the coming empire of Spanish Fascism. We all know how he and his fellow criminals cut up the map. He was going to get all of French Africa, except Tunisia, which went to Italy. This comes out in Count Ciano's diary, and in some of the records now available at Nurnberg.

The fact that his fellow criminals were defeated in war does not in the least mitigate his responsibilities or diminish his guilt. The man is as much a war criminal as any of those now on trial at Nurnberg. (*Applause.*)

If we know anything at all, we know that he will seize the very earliest opportunity to use against us the dagger and the poison which are the familiar weapons of such bandits. But even so, I don't quite agree with my friend, Mr. Brown, about driving him out.

I don't think we, the United Nations, have to do that. I believe that if we cease supporting the Spanish-Fascist regime, it will fall of itself, thanks to the brave and undefeated Spanish people. (*Applause.*)

All the evidence is that Franco's regime, which was never popular, is at its lowest stage of discredit right now inside Spain. It is sustained only by the friendly gener-

osity of the British and American governments.

If recognition were withdrawn, and with recognition, certain essential supplies, Franco wouldn't last very long. It is downright foolish to suggest that our withdrawal of recognition constitutes intervention.

All through our history we have refused to recognize regimes of which we disapprove, and nobody ever said this was intervention. For about 15 years, we refused to recognize the Soviet Union, for example, and it flourished just the same.

Perhaps Franco would flourish too, but all the evidence is against that possibility.

What I feel is that we owe it to ourselves, to our essential self-respect, as human beings, and as Americans, to act upon this matter, to act upon it. We have officially branded Fascist Spain as being unfit for membership in the United Nations. All of our official statements show that we disapprove of this regime which was inimical to us in the war and contains within itself a perpetual threat to security.

Having gone on record in this way, why don't we take the action to which our words point? That is, why don't we withdraw our recognition of this last fascist bandit? A recognition that should never have been extended in the first place.

Our policy in this matter has al-

ways been subject to the influences of organized pressure groups, which pursue not the dignity or security of the United States but other objectives. I think we should end this state of affairs by breaking clean with our enemy—Franco! (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Sheean. Now let us hop back to the other side of the ball, the negative side, and hear from Mr. C. G. Spaulding, literary editor of *The Commonwealth*. Mr. Paulding.

Mr. Paulding:

It would have been wonderful, Mr. Sheean, and how wonderfully you would have written about it, if we could have finished this war and have looked around then and seen every nation, everywhere, a democracy, and people everywhere voting for the right things.

There would have been the ruined cities—the ruins everywhere—and famine, because when there is a war, these are things the war leaves behind. There would have been also the counted and the uncounted dead. These, being dead, could not vote, but the living would have been walking around in the clear, bright light of peace intent on merging all the nations into one world.

That's not what happened. We finished the war and there are all these people without a country, or else they have a country to which

they dare not return, or they can't return. The Poles, who fought with us against the Germans, dare not return to Poland. Spaniards, who were the first to fight against the Germans, cannot return to Spain. The Jews can't go anywhere.

This misery all over Europe is a threat to peace, but to a peace which has not yet been established. The German vacuum, the French nation divided and uncertain, the Italian people punished and forgotten, the Polish people diseased, starving, concealed from sight, threaten the peace we have not created. Franco's Spain threatens that peace, but neither the Poles nor the French, nor the Germans, nor Franco's navy, or those cruel men of his that wear the three-cornered hats, or all his generals, could be a threat against the unmatched military power of Britain and America, and Russia. Spain alone could never threaten anyone.

The question tonight, "Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?" is not the military question to which a negative answer is obvious. Our opponents know it's obvious. It is a difficult question. The answer is difficult because all of us would like to be able to say "Yes," but the answer "Yes" implies action.

Mr. Brown asks us to say that Franco is a threat to peace because he wants us to act. He is logical,

but he would be more logical if he told us what our actions would bring—what intervention would mean.

With so many others, I hoped, thought, and wrote that with victory the Franco regime would collapse. It has not collapsed. I want it to fall. If we intervene, it will fall. If we say "Yes" to tonight's question, it is because we want to intervene. Saying "Yes" we acquire the technical right to intervene, but I answer "No" to tonight's question because I'm sick of intervening with words and I dread what will happen should we intervene with acts.

We intervened with words in Argentina and Peron was elected. We have intervened with words in Spain again and again and Franco remains. We have not intervened wherever a great power desires us not to intervene. (*Applause.*)

By answering "Yes" to tonight's question, we assume the duty to act in Spain. We start a process which we may not be able to stop—a process which leads from blockade to armed intervention, and not impossibly to an occupation of Spain on the German pattern, with three or four zones and Russians, Frenchmen, Americans, and British telling the Spanish people all about democracy and telling each other that none of them understands what it means.

If we stop somewhere short on this road, it would mean sending

Spaniards outside Spain to fight another civil war within Spain.

If we stop at another point, it means asking the Spanish people to revolt against the Franco beliefs and military machinery, which is to ask once again the Spanish people to get themselves killed.

I'm tired of easy, agreeable heroism. I'm tired of asking people to starve so that we can absorb them and say they're heroes. (*Applause.*)

It comes to this. The only means we have of bringing pressure to bear on Franco are means that bring pressure and suffering upon the Spanish people. They bring danger of civil war to Spain. They bring that danger to the great powers that for contradictory reasons intervene in Spain. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Paulding. Well, gentlemen, you don't make the job of the United Nations Security Council any easier by your discussion here tonight. In fact, you seem to make it perfectly clear to us that we've got to do some pretty straight thinking and consider all sides of this question. But, will you join me up here around the microphone now while we continue this discussion before we let the audience in on this question? Mr. Brown, we haven't heard from you for a time; perhaps you have an observation or a question.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

JAMES VINCENT SHEEAN — Mr. Sheean was born in Christian County, Illinois, in 1899. He received his college education at the University of Chicago. Mr. Sheean is the author of many books including *The Tide*, *Personal History*, *Sanfelice*, *The Pieces of a Fan*, *A Day of Battle*, *Not Peace But a Sword*, *Bird of the Wilderness*, *Between the Thunder and the Sun*, and *This House Against This House*, which is just off the press. During World War II, he served with the U. S. Army Air Forces. He has written many magazine articles and is well-known as a foreign correspondent.

Cecil Brown — A radio reporter and war correspondent, Mr. Brown is also well known for his book *Suez to Singapore*, published in 1942. Born in New Brighton, Pa., he attended Western Reserve University and Ohio State University. He sailed as a seaman on freighters to Russia, South America, and West Africa, and the stories of his experiences were published in the Youngstown, Ohio, *Vindicator*. In 1931, he became a United Press reporter in Los Angeles. In 1933, he was editor of the Prescott, Arizona, *Journal-Miner*. During the next few years, he served on the staffs the *Pittsburgh Press*, *Newark Ledger*, and the *New York American*.

After a short period with the Columbia Broadcasting System in 1937, Mr. Brown went to Europe and Africa where he did free lance writing. He was a reporter for International News Service in Paris

and Rome until late in 1939. After February of 1940, Mr. Brown did news broadcasting for Columbia from Rome, Yugoslavia, Cairo, Singapore, and Australia. Since 1942, he has been broadcasting from New York. For his overseas broadcasts he received awards from Sigma Delta Chi, Overseas Press Club, National Council for Education by Radio, National Headliners Club, and the George Foster Peabody award.

In addition to the book, *Suez to Singapore*, Mr. Brown is the author of many magazine articles.

CHARLES GOUVERNEUR PAULDING — Mr. Paulding is literary editor of *The Commonwealth*.

THEODORE LOTHROP STODDARD — Mr. Stoddard, who was born in 1883 in Brookline, Mass., has an A.B., and A.M., and a Ph.D. from Harvard, and a J.B. degree from Boston University. In 1908, he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar. His books, which number more than a score, include *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World-Supremacy*, *The New World of Islam*, *The Revolt Against Civilization*, *Racial Realities in Europe*, *Social Classes in Post-War Europe* (1925), *Re-Forging America*, *The Story of Youth*, *Luck—Your Silent Partner*, *Europe and Our Money*, *Clashing Tides of Color*, and *Into the Darkness*.

In addition to his work as an author, Mr. Stoddard is also a radio commentator for Station WMAL in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Brown: I would like to ask our opponents if they feel that Fascism is an internal matter after the recent history and whether Fascism as an internal matter becomes of concern to us only when the trains in Spain run on time. Do we wait until that moment?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Paulding, would you take that?

Mr. Paulding: We are not discussing the benefits of Fascism. We've been told—Mr. Sheean and Mr. Brown have told us all about Fascism. The only trouble is that

I've opposed Fascism since long before the Ethiopian war, and I thought I'd found out what Fascism was. I'm dead against it. The question tonight is, is it an immediate threat—a military threat to peace—the peace that exists now, or isn't it? If it is, we intervene. If we intervene, we've got to know what happens when we do intervene.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Sheean.

Mr. Sheean: Mr. Paulding, why are you against Fascism? (Laughter.)

Mr. Paulding: For one reason, because you've written such a good diagnosis of it in all your books. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Sheean: But I thought the main reason for being against Fascism was that it was a threat to peace.

Mr. Paulding: I said it was a threat to peace but to the peace that we haven't founded. Do you think, Mr. Sheean, that we've got a peace now to defend? We've got an unstable situation to preserve, not to jump into another war for no reason. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Sheean: We must do our best. We must do our best.

Mr. Paulding: Fine, that's as I say.

Mr. Sheean: O.K. Doing our best is not sustaining a fascist regime in that particular point in Europe.

Mr. Paulding: I'll tell you what it is. It's getting American trade unions to help as far as possible Spanish trade unions. It's to break through this barrier which divides us from Spain and help the Spanish people, but it certainly isn't doing our best to ask them to get up and get killed. I don't see how you can intervene without risking that.

Mr. Sheean: There's no question of intervening—no question. All we have to do is withdraw our recognition of this bandit. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Paulding: I'm so glad you said that because I was getting terribly worried how to get you back on the program with the opposition, because you say Spain can't attack anybody. You say Spain's weak and all you ask is nonrecognition which is extremely mildish. I'm perfectly in agreement with that. I don't think that is what Mr. Brown wants.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Brown?

Mr. Brown: May I ask you, Mr. Paulding, what for you constitutes a threat to peace? Would you have said, in 1931, that Japanese aggression in Manchuria was of any concern to us? Do you have to wait, as Dr. Oscar Lange said to the Security Council, until bombs drop on your head? An atomic bomb would do more than destroy your head. Do you have to wait until then before you're convinced that a country is a threat to peace? Can't you have a long-range view after our history from 1931 on? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Paulding: Mr. Brown, I'm so sorry you mentioned history because it's been worrying me. You seem to have forgotten that we won a war. The threat to peace was a real threat to peace when the Italians first started thinking about Ethiopia. It was a threat to peace in the Civil War in Spain. Quite a few things have happened since then. One isolated country in a famished continent can hardly be a threat to peace.

Mr. Brown: We haven't won a war until every nation in the world is secure. And not many nations in the world feel secure today. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Stoddard, would you like to get in on this?

Mr. Stoddard: But the elimination of Franco, even if it were possible without starting another civil war and possible repercussions, would hardly insure world peace by itself. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Brown: May I ask what assurance will you give us that there will not be a Spanish civil war without intervention? How long do you suppose the Spanish people are going to stand for, as Sheean says, this bandit in Madrid?

The Spanish people will rise and revolt with or without our intervention. What I'm asking for is intervention that will reduce the pain and the suffering and the hunger. We're as much humanitarians as you people are, but we're also concerned with freedom for the Spanish people. We're asking for what many observers say 70 to 80 per cent of the Spanish people want. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Paulding: My impression is not that the Spanish government-

in-exile is asking or saying that. The Spanish government-in-exile is much more humanitarian than Americans speaking about Europe. It does not think that the Spanish people can rise against police and military machinery without a massacre and it has never wanted the Spanish people to rise alone.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Well, gentlemen, I think we've come to a very good place for us to pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air from Town Hall in New York City where we are carrying on a discussion of the question "Is Franco Spain a Threat To World Peace?" We have heard from Vincent Sheean, Cecil Brown, C. G. Paulding, and Lothrop Stoddard. They are about to take questions from the audience.

For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period to follow immediately, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclose 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Be sure to include your zone number and allow at least two weeks for delivery. Now, Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: To promote good questions, Town Hall is offering a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the question that's considered best, in the opinion of our committee of judges, for the purpose of bringing out facts and clarifying the discussion, provided those questions are limited to twenty-five words. And, goodness knows, we need to bring out facts that clarify discussion on all of these topics.

So, if you have questions, please raise your hand with the proper number card so that I'll know to whom your question is directed. Questions, please! We'll start with the gentleman over there on the aisle.

Man: Mr. Stoddard. Is it not true that Franco engaged propagandists, both official and nonofficial, in this country who were linked with the Nazis and their Christian Front dupes?

Mr. Stoddard: I couldn't say offhand whether that's been officially determined or not. I understand that the chances are it is so, but that, to my mind, does not constitute an immediate threat to world peace. Don't think, my dear sir, that either I or Mr. Paulding has any use for the Franco regime. We are simply taking the attitude that it does not constitute such an immediate threat to world peace and security as would justify what we consider the very dangerous and

inhumane steps advocated by those who recommend them tonight.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Stoddard. The gentleman right here on the aisle.

Man: This is to Mr. Brown. What sanction shall we apply to Franco in our peace?

Mr. Denny: In our attempt to get him out? Is that what you mean?

Mr. Brown: I think the logical first step is, as Mr. Sheean suggested, withdrawal of recognition—the condemnation of 51 nations of the world denouncing this regime in Spain as an enemy of mankind. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman there.

Man: My question is for Mr. Sheean. Knowing that Franco was installed in power by Hitler and Mussolini's intervention, why should we allow Poland to lead the democratic fight to oust him?

Mr. Denny: Well, that's what you call a procedural question.

Mr. Sheean: That's rather a jump and I'm afraid I don't understand it.

Mr. Denny: Well, it's why should we allow Poland to oust Franco?

Mr. Sheean: Well, why not?

Man: Knowing that Franco was installed in power through Hitler and Mussolini's intervention, why

should we allow Poland to lead the democratic fight to oust him?

Mr. Denny: That's a question that backfires, Mr. Sheean.

Mr. Sheean: It's over my head. I say anybody who belongs to the Security Council has got a right to introduce a resolution.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man there.

Man: Mr. Stoddard. If Spain does not threaten world peace because of immediate lack of military power, wouldn't that also apply to occupied Germany and Japan?

Mr. Stoddard: No, I can't see any resemblance between the two cases. Germany and Japan are thoroughly beaten and occupied countries and so long as they are occupied they can offer absolutely no threat to peace. They are simply occupied—out of the game. I don't see any analogy between the two cases.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady here.

Lady: Mr. Paulding, you said something about suffering and starvation and that you don't want to see any more of it. What are the conditions of the people of Spain today? Is there any suffering and starvation so far as you know?

Mr. Paulding: Well, I don't know but I imagine things are pretty bad. They may be just a margin better than the other parts of the world. But it's certainly bad. It's so bad that nothing

should be done to aggravate it—not taking one meal away from one Spanish worker.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady over here.

Lady: Mr. Brown. Would an official world boycott of Spain establish a dangerous precedent that might be used against any nation whose system incurred the dislike of another nation?

Mr. Brown: It's quite possible. But we're trying to finish one war. We're finishing a nation that was a partner of the fascist countries we have just finished fighting. We've got to finish that business. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Paulding has a comment.

Mr. Paulding: Just one comment. I think it's a little disingenuous—Mr. Sheean a little while ago with that question over there, didn't seem to recognize the obvious illusion to Russia behind Poland in bringing out this question. The answer to this question also seems to be disingenuous.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The young man with the red tie over there.

Man: Question to Mr. Sheean. If the U.N. declares Franco Spain a threat to world peace, are the Spanish Republicans strong enough to destroy Franco without material aid from the Allied countries?

Mr. Denny: That's a very practical question.

Mr. Sheean: This is a question so practical and so technical that I'm not prepared to answer it.

Mr. Denny: Anyone else here on the platform like to tackle that question? What happens if you declare that Franco is a threat to world peace? Do any of you gentlemen know? Mr. Stoddard?

Mr. Stoddard: Well, so far as I know, short of force, there is very little that could be done because the best information is that Franco has a well-drilled army of at least half a million men and with civil and frontier guards of the Moorish troops about seven or eight hundred thousand.

Now, practically all those men know that they have halters around their necks if there is a civil war and they get beaten. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that they will bare their necks to the knife unless the knife is very large and probably wielded from outside in great effect.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Brown, do you want to add anything to that? Does that seem clear? All right. The other man with the red bow tie. Yes?

Man: Mr. Brown. Aren't there many countries beside Spain who are dictatorial, heartless, and have not fought the Axis? If so, why must Spain cause a war?

Mr. Brown: Why must Spain cause a war?

Mr. Denny: I suppose what he means is why is Spain a threat to

world peace—to bring it down to the subject.

Mr. Brown: Well, Fascism reminds me of my youth in one way when I used to play with firecrackers on the Fourth of July. I remember then we'd buy these small firecrackers all fastened together with a string and you lit one firecracker and they all went off in quick succession. I think the past history of Fascism is something like those firecrackers. Wherever a center of Fascism remains, there there is the inspiration and the necessity to make another war. That's my answer.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Sheean?

Mr. Sheean: But also the questioner said "other countries which had dictatorial regimes and had not fought the Axis." Spain didn't fight the Axis. Spain actively aided the Axis. It's a different thing. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Paulding has a question here for Mr. Sheean.

Mr. Paulding: It's a question, Mr. Sheean, because I do want to protect the interests of Russia in this thing. They seem to be strangely neglected. Has he thought of the Russian emotions at seeing capitalist countries intervening in Spain. I think that is one of the troubles that quite seriously we talk about our worries about Russia, but you must see the other point of view that Russia probably has very strong worries about us

coming into Spain. Has Mr. Sheean any comment on that?

Mr. Sheean: I am much less concerned about Russia than Mr. Paulding is. I am an American. I am concerned about the United States. (*Applause.*) I think that the United States is behaving badly in this matter. I don't care anything about Russia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Paulding says he asked for it. (*Laughter.*) The gentleman on the second row of the balcony.

Man: My question is to Mr. Stoddard. On what principle do the United States and England justify that severing relations with Spain constitutes an interference with Spain's internal affairs?

Mr. Stoddard: Well, it's very simple. Because, unless Poland can clearly prove that the actions of the Franco government are such as to genuinely and immediately threaten the peace and security of the world, that would constitute intervention in the internal affairs of a nation, which is specifically forbidden by the Charter, as in my remarks I quoted. It would simply be intervention unless actions of the Spanish government could definitely prove to the contrary.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Sheean wants to add something to that.

Mr. Sheean: We have very often refused recognition to regimes which we did not approve of. In the time of the late Mr. Calvin Coolidge, we had a definite prin-

ciple: We will not recognize any government set up by violence. Mr. Coolidge said that, and we refused to recognize a good many in South America, as you remember. Franco was put in there by violence—German and Italian violence. Nobody can deny that. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Stoddard: Yes, but, Mr. Sheean, I think that you are half-and-half in this debate. You seem to think that mere nonrecognition would do the trick, but that is not the attitude of Mr. Cecil Brown. He clearly implies and practically says that we ought to clean Franco out no matter what the consequences or what it takes. I'm addressing my remarks and I am thinking of Mr. Brown's whole-hog thesis and not the little-pig thesis of Mr. Sheean.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Brown, that brings you to your feet.

Mr. Brown: Yes, it does. I haven't advocated an invasion of Spain. What I would like to see is an aroma of democracy waft out of Washington and headed in the direction of Spain. (*Applause.*)

There's one other point that I confess very readily has me somewhat confused because it seems to me that we here, tonight, and, for that matter, in a sense the Security Council out at Hunter College are both discussing and debating something that I thought the United Nations had already decided; namely, that Franco Spain is a

threat to world peace. (*Applause.*) That was a statement and not a summation of anything I'd said yet. I would call your attention to the meeting of the General Assembly in London last February when the General Assembly confirmed the resolution at Potsdam that Fascist Spain would not be admitted to the United Nations. Fascist Spain is the one country in the world specifically banned from the United Nations.

One other point—the United Nations was set up on the premise and the promise that these nations in the U. N. are seekers of peace. One nation was kept out. The reverse is such a nation is a seeker of war. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Paulding?

Mr. Paulding: Mr. Brown has just brought some help to a cause that was in trouble. He says that the United Nations would not let Spain in. I know that; I was in San Francisco at the time. My point is that all this talk about nonrecognition sounds so benign, but it doesn't put Franco out. He does not answer what he means to go on, if that doesn't work—and it hasn't worked so far.

Mr. Brown: What you're asking is to keep Franco in.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Paulding, is that right?

Mr. Paulding: That was a little flippant, that remark. I won't answer it. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The lady.

Lady: Don't you think the strategic position of Gibraltar has a great deal to do with the importance and its entrance to Mediterranean has a lot to do with the attitude of Britain and America?

Mr. Denny: This is for you, Mr. Paulding. Do you think the strategic position of Gibraltar has anything to do with American and Britain's attitude in this particular crisis?

Mr. Paulding: I don't think so. I think Gibraltar is a dead duck militarily and navally. Since the atom bomb, I think they're past any kind of talk about technical military danger of Spain, or Gibraltar, or Dakar, or any other little point in the world. Any base is nonsense now. The war can only be between immense powers and immense weapons. I don't think anybody is worrying much about Gibraltar.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Sheean. Mr. Sheean, do you feel that with no intervention and Spain had overthrown Franco, do you feel that she would not be put in danger of Communism?

Mr. Sheean: I'm not sure of that. I think that if the Spanish people are in any overwhelming majority Communists, then they will have a Communist regime. This will happen anyway, whatever Mr. Paulding says. But I am not con-

vinced that that is the case. My experience in Spain was that most of them were Socialists and Anarchists. The Communists were the smallest proportion.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Sheean. The third row in the balcony.

Man: Mr. Stoddard. I'm the author of a recent book on Spain. How do you reconcile our State Department's recent sale of military supplies to Franco, with our State Department's recent declared intention to encourage the Spanish people to overthrow Franco?

Mr. Stoddard: To what specific war materials do you refer?

Man: I'm referring to C-47 planes, which the State Department has admitted were sold. I refer to jeeps and trucks which the *New York Times* reported took part in the April 1 parade in Madrid. Those are only a few in addition to the millions of blankets we have sold to the Moors, the mercenary army that is supporting Franco.

Mr. Stoddard: But none of those were specifically military weapons. (*Shouts of "No."*) They were weapons that might be used militarily.

Man: Forty-seven transport planes, not military weapons!

Mr. Stoddard: They were demilitarized. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Paulding wants to come in on this. Mr. Paulding.

Mr. Paulding: I have to come in on that because I view the army's demilitarizing of its materials—blankets, or planes, or anything else—like a sort of completely careless black market operation that we're doing all over the world. We're selling them to anybody. We hear stories that they are going all over the place. That has nothing to do with policy. That's an army getting rid of its material—dumping it into the sea, selling it, giving it away.

Man: It has a lot to do with putting our actions into words.

Mr. Sheean: To whom are we selling them? To whom are we selling them?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Sheean says, "To whom are we selling them?"

Mr. Paulding: Probably to all our enemies. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Sheean: We are not selling them to Chinese Communists. We are not selling them to Generalissimo Tito. Who are we selling them to?

Mr. Paulding: I said to our enemies. I didn't list our friends. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: That's a pretty tough question that gentleman is asking—for the State Department to be consistent, in the world today. (*Laughter.*) All right, Mr. Brown, you have a comment on that question, yes?

Mr. Brown: That questioner, who has written a very fine book on Spain, reminds me of one point

and that is that the United States Government has already intervened in Spain. We have asked the Spanish people to get rid of Franco. We have asked the Spanish people to go out and fight Franco without our offering them one single bit of physical or moral support. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Brown, just to keep the record straight, after we did that didn't we also come out a few weeks later and say that Spain is not a threat to world peace?

Mr. Brown: Our position was stated by the State Department that we do not like Franco and we hope, as Secretary Stettinius said at the Security Council yesterday, that Franco will be removed by peaceful means by the Spanish people.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Stoddard?

Mr. Stoddard: But how does that square with the previous statement of Mr. Brown that our State Department asked the Spanish people to fight Franco? Peaceful means does not connote fighting.

Mr. Brown: How do you remove Franco—a delegation of Spanish people call on Franco and say, "Please get out"? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: The young man here.

Man: Don't you think it would be easier to intervene now in Spain than to wait until there might be a chance of another world war?

Mr. Denny: That's for you, Mr. Paulding.

Mr. Paulding: Well, if we're going to wait for a repetition of everything that's happened, I've just got no answer at all. We could have intervened in Spain during the last war. Spain could have risen against Franco during the last war. The people could have, that is, theoretically they could have; practically, they couldn't. I don't know what's going to happen. If there's another war, the last thing in the world we'll care about is what happens to Spain.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Paulding. While Mr. Paulding and Mr. Sheean prepare their summaries for this evening's discussion—we'll hear from them in just a moment—here's our Announcer to tell you about your Town Meeting for the next two weeks.

Announcer: Next week we take up the question that is discussed wherever people meet from coast to coast and talk politics, "What Should Be Our Policy Toward Russia?" The President of the United States, in his recent Army Day speech said that in order to maintain our international commitments, we must be strong. He advocated unification of all of our armed services, temporary extension of the draft, and universal military training.

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, strongly opposes this view, while the Honorable George H. Earle,

former United States Minister to Bulgaria, upholds the President's position. They will be our only two speakers next week.

The following week, May 2, we will have the program originally announced for this week, when the new head of UNRRA, the Honorable Fiorello H. LaGuardia, will discuss the question, "What Can We As Individuals Do To Help Prevent World-Wide Famine?" The questions you sent in this week will be used on that program.

If you want to send in a question on next week's topic, "What Should Be Our Policy Toward Russia," limit your question to 25 words and address them to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here's Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: And here's Mr. Paulding for the summary of the negative. Mr. Paulding.

Mr. Paulding: It has looked at times, tonight, as if some of us didn't like each other up here. That's not true. We've practically come to an agreement with Mr. Sheean. Mr. Brown, I hope, will follow and join us, because very seriously, in spite of what he said about our supporting Hitler and Franco, in one case it would be the week's neatest trick because Hitler is somewhere—gone—and can't be supported, and in the other case it's just absurd.

In spite of that, we all want, and I repeat it in all sincerity, we all want the Franco regime to fall. The opponents think that—some of them think—a mere declaration will do it, that is, keeping Spain out of the United Nations, which is already in the course of process. They haven't once proved that Spain is—in English—a literal menace, a threat to peace at the present time. That's what they were supposed to do and they haven't even attempted to do it. They've given us a long discussion on the horrors of Fascism on which I thoroughly agree with them. I can't see why we can't be friends, because what we are after is the technique to get Franco out without ruining Spain, more than it's ruined and without imperiling peace. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Paulding. Now a final word from Vincent Sheean.

Mr. Sheean: Cecil Brown and I have taken the view that it is our duty to our self-respect as human beings to cut off all relations with this bandit. We feel this because of the story of the past six years and not even because of the Civil War in Spain. Because of *this* war, because of Franco's relationship with Hitler and Mussolini, his proved complicity in the crimes for which other people are now being tried, and we feel this because, at the present moment, today, he may not be attacking, he

may not attack France, he may not attack the United States, or Russia—he couldn't. The only reason why he doesn't is that he can't. With the changing possibilities, the things that we can foresee within a year or two, this creature will be one of the most nefarious, one of the most despicable and horrible influences in the history of our century. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, thank you, Mr. Vincent Sheean. And all four of the speakers for giving us an enlightened discussion on tonight's very complex and involved question.

Now our committee of judges has awarded a prize of a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the following question—the name of the speaker was not given but if she will come up and identify herself afterwards, she will get this \$25 United States War Bond. The question is, "Wouldn't an official world boycott of Spain establish a dangerous precedent which could be used against any nation whose system of government we disliked?" Congratulations, Miss Blank, whoever you are.* (*Applause.*)

*The winner of the War Bond was Emily R. Borrow, 323 Park Avenue, Newark, N.J.

MAY 2 1944



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

17. Should We or an International Authority Control Strategic Bases in the Pacific?
18. How Can We Make Jobs for All Now?
19. Should Hollywood Make Movies Designed To Influence Public Opinion?
20. Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?
21. Who Should Control the Atomic Bomb?
22. How Can We Assure a Lasting Peace in Japan?
23. Is the Full Employment Bill a Threat to Private Industry?
25. On What Basis Can Russia and the Western Powers Reach a Peace Settlement?
26. Should We Share the Secret of the Atomic Bomb With Any Other Nation?
27. How Can We Find a Basis for Industrial Peace?
28. Should We Support the Establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine Now?
29. Should We Have a Single Department for Our Armed Forces?
30. We Won the War; Are We Winning the Peace?
31. Does the Atomic Bomb Make World Government Essential Now?
34. Should Colonial Empires Be Liquidated?
35. What Should Be Our Policy in China?
36. What Must We Do To Denazify the German People?
37. Should Congress Approve the Proposed Loan to Britain?
39. Can We Find a Substitute for Strikes?
40. Which Way to Full Employment?
41. Do We Need More Democracy in Our Armed Forces?
42. Are We Losing Our Religion?
45. What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe?
46. Do Our Movies Tend To Raise or Lower Our Moral Standards?
47. Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?
48. Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?
49. Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?
50. What Are the Real Issues Behind the Russian-Iranian Dispute?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Any Twenty-six Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: } Any 26 Weeks Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c